

Africa .....	2
♦ SUDAN: HUMANITARIAN CRISIS, PEACE TALKS, TERRORISM, AND U.S. POLICY .....	2
East Asia .....	2
♦ CHINA'S CHARM: IMPLICATIONS OF CHINESE SOFT POWER .....	2
♦ CHINA-U.S. RELATIONS: CURRENT ISSUES AND IMPLICATIONS FOR U.S. POLICY .....	3
♦ TAIWAN: RECENT DEVELOPMENTS AND U.S. POLICY CHOICES.....	3
Eurasia.....	3
♦ UKRAINE: CURRENT ISSUES AND U.S. POLICY .....	3
Foreign aid .....	4
♦ AFRICA: U.S. FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ISSUES.....	4
♦ SECURITY BY OTHER MEANS: FOREIGN ASSISTANCE, GLOBAL POVERTY, AND AMERICAN LEADERSHIP.....	4
♦ U.S. FOREIGN AID TO THE PALESTINIANS.....	5
Landmines.....	5
♦ TO WALK THE EARTH IN SAFETY, 6TH EDITION .....	5
Latin America .....	5
♦ CUBA: ISSUES FOR THE 109TH CONGRESS .....	5
Middle East.....	6
♦ EGYPT: BACKGROUND AND U.S. RELATIONS .....	6
♦ IRAN: U.S. CONCERNS AND POLICY RESPONSES.....	6
♦ IRAN'S INFLUENCE IN IRAQ.....	6
♦ LEBANON .....	7
♦ LIBYA: BACKGROUND AND U.S. RELATIONS.....	7
♦ SYRIA: U.S. RELATIONS AND BILATERAL ISSUES.....	7
Peacekeeping.....	7
♦ UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING: ISSUES FOR CONGRESS .....	7
South & Central Asia.....	8
♦ AFGHANISTAN AND ITS NEIGHBORS: AN EVER DANGEROUS NEIGHBORHOOD .....	8
♦ CENTRAL ASIA AND ITS ASIAN NEIGHBORS: SECURITY AND COMMERCE AT THE CROSSROADS .....	8
♦ CENTRAL ASIA: REGIONAL DEVELOPMENTS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR U.S. INTERESTS.....	9
♦ PAKISTAN-U.S. RELATIONS .....	9
♦ U.S. NUCLEAR COOPERATION WITH INDIA: ISSUES FOR CONGRESS .....	9
War on Terror .....	10

♦ THE COST OF IRAQ, AFGHANISTAN, AND OTHER GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR OPERATIONS SINCE 9/11 .....	10
Miscellaneous .....	10
♦ DIVERSITY AS FOREIGN POLICY ASSET .....	10
♦ FOREIGN OPERATIONS (HOUSE)/STATE, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, AND RELATED PROGRAMS (SENATE): FY2007 APPROPRIATIONS.....	10
♦ POWS AND MIAS: STATUS AND ACCOUNTING ISSUES .....	11
♦ PROTECTION OF NATIONAL SECURITY INFORMATION .....	11
♦ SECURITY CLASSIFIED AND CONTROLLED INFORMATION: HISTORY, STATUS, AND EMERGING MANAGEMENT ISSUES .....	12

See previous “Documents on the Web” at  
<http://france.usembassy.gov/irc/intrelations/webalert/default.htm>



## **Africa**

### **♦ SUDAN: HUMANITARIAN CRISIS, PEACE TALKS, TERRORISM, AND U.S. POLICY**

Ted Dagne.

Congressional Research Service, The Library of Congress, updated June 1, 2006, 18 p.

<http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/crs/ib98043.pdf>

On May 4, 2006, the Government of National Unity and the Sudan Liberation Movement (SLM) signed the Darfur Peace Agreement (DPA) after almost two years of negotiations. The agreement was rejected by two other Darfur groups: the Justice and Equality Movement (JEM) and a splinter group from the SLM. The agreement calls for the integration of Sudan Liberation Army troops into the Sudan Armed Forces, provides \$300 million initially and \$200 million for the next two years for reconstruction and compensation purposes for Darfur, and establishes the Transitional Darfur Regional Authority (TDRA). The agreement provides seats for the SLM in the national and regional parliaments and several top positions, including the chairmanship of the TDRA. The agreement also calls for the disarmament and demobilization of the Janjaweed.

\* In February 2006, the Bush Administration submitted a supplemental appropriations request for Iraq, Afghanistan, funding for the Gulf Coast hurricanes, and other foreign policy priorities, including a request for 514.1 million for Sudan/Darfur.

\* On March 16, 2006, the House approved \$618.1 million: \$499.1 million for Darfur (\$66.3 million for IDFA, \$11.7 million for refugees, \$173 million for African Union peacekeeping, \$150 million for food aid, \$98.1 million for CIPA-U.N. peacekeeping), and \$119 million for Southern Sudan (\$12.3 million for refugees, \$75 million for food aid, \$31.7 for CIPA-U.N. peacekeeping).

\* On April 4, 2006, the Senate Appropriations Committee approved \$564 million for Sudan/Darfur: \$125 million for South Sudan and \$439 million for Darfur.

\* On May 4, 2006, the full Senate approved \$624 million for Sudan: \$125 million for Southern Sudan and \$499.1 million for Darfur.

## **East Asia**

### **♦ CHINA'S CHARM: IMPLICATIONS OF CHINESE SOFT POWER**

Josh Kurlantzick.

Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (CEIP), June 2006, 8 p.

[http://www.carnegieendowment.org/files/PB\\_47\\_FINAL.pdf](http://www.carnegieendowment.org/files/PB_47_FINAL.pdf)

This report analyzes China's influence and policy tools of soft power and argues that, while China's rising soft power could prove benign or even beneficial in some respects, it could prove disastrous for Southeast Asia-for democratization, for anticorruption initiatives, and for good governance.

The author advocates the following responses to China's soft power: "Today the United States should have one person in each embassy examining that nation's bilateral relations with China." A focused policy would include:

- \* Rebuilding the United States' own soft power in the region, including expanding one-person consulates to allow missions in large nations like Indonesia to cover their vast territory;
- \* Rethinking U.S. sanctions on Southeast Asia;
- \* Revamping the Foreign Service so that regionalists and language specialists are better rewarded for their skills;
- \* Reconsidering cutting regional broadcasting like Voice of America's Thai service;
- \* Rethinking stringent student visa policies; and
- \* Copying Chinese-style blending of political trips and business delegations.

#### ◆ CHINA-U.S. RELATIONS: CURRENT ISSUES AND IMPLICATIONS FOR U.S. POLICY

Kerry Dumbaugh, Specialist in Asian Affairs, Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division  
Congressional Research Service, The Library of Congress, updated June 8, 2006, 40 p.  
<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/68819.pdf>

Throughout much of the George W. Bush Administration, U.S.-China relations have remained unusually smooth and stable. But in the 109th Congress, U.S. policy toward China appears to be subject to competing reassessments. State Department officials late in 2005 unveiled what they described as a new policy framework for the relationship - one in which the United States was willing to work cooperatively with a non-democratic China while encouraging Beijing to become a "responsible stakeholder" in the global system. Other U.S. policymakers appear to be adopting somewhat tougher stances on issues involving China and U.S.-China relations, expressing their concerns about strong PRC economic growth and a more assertive and influential PRC diplomacy in the international arena.

#### ◆ TAIWAN: RECENT DEVELOPMENTS AND U.S. POLICY CHOICES

Kerry Dumbaugh, Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division  
Congressional Research Service, The Library of Congress, Issue Brief, updated June 8, 2006, 19 p.  
<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/68803.pdf>

Political trends in Taiwan have raised anxieties about its future and the implications for U.S. policy. Some are concerned that a continued emphasis on "Taiwan identity" may lead to ethnic polarization and conflict. Others are concerned about the implications that these trends have for a possible declaration of Taiwan independence, which Beijing has vowed to "pay any price" to prevent. In recent months, political developments in Taiwan appear to be causing the Bush Administration to dial back its earlier enthusiasm for supporting Taiwan. U.S. officials now appear to be balancing criticisms of the PRC military buildup opposite Taiwan with periodic cautions and warnings to the effect that U.S. support for Taiwan is not unconditional, but has limits. This issue brief tracks the situation in Taiwan.

### Eurasia

#### ◆ UKRAINE: CURRENT ISSUES AND U.S. POLICY

Steven Woehrel, Specialist in European Affairs, Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division  
Congressional Research Service, The Library of Congress, updated June 7, 2006, 13 p.  
<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/68798.pdf>

U.S. officials supported the "Orange Revolution" in Ukraine in late 2004 and early 2005, warning the former regime against trying to impose fraudulent election results, and hailing Yushchenko's ultimate victory. U.S. officials have remained upbeat about Ukraine's successes in some areas, such as adopting legislation needed for WTO membership and in improving media freedom, while acknowledging difficulties in others. Administration officials have also praised Ukraine's efforts to hold a free and fair parliamentary election on March 26, 2006.

## **Foreign aid**

### **◆ AFRICA: U.S. FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ISSUES**

Ted Dagne, Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division

Congressional Research Service, The Library of Congress, updated June 19, 2006, 19 p.

<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/69430.pdf>

U.S. assistance finds its way to Africa through a variety of channels. Bilateral or country-to-country aid, also known as direct assistance, is given through non-governmental organizations (NGOs) or private and voluntary organizations (PVOs), contractors, and African government ministries and agencies. Multilateral aid, or indirect assistance, is given first to international financial institutions (IFIs) and U.N. agencies, which in turn channel it to Africa through their own programs.

### **◆ SECURITY BY OTHER MEANS: FOREIGN ASSISTANCE, GLOBAL POVERTY, AND AMERICAN LEADERSHIP**

Lael Brainard, Editor.

Brookings Institution and the Center for Strategic and International Studies

(CSIS), Task Force on Transforming Foreign Assistance for the 21st Century.

June 22, 2006, 251 p.

[http://www.brookings.edu/global/security\\_chapters.htm](http://www.brookings.edu/global/security_chapters.htm)

In the introduction to this collection of essays, the editor states: "With hard power assets stretched thin and confronting unprecedented global challenges of transnational threats, poverty, and pandemics, America must reform its weak aid infrastructure to leverage its soft power more effectively. While foreign assistance funding has seen the greatest increase in four decades, this has brought a proliferation of programs, policy incoherence and organizational fragmentation. Moving around the organizational boxes or increasing aid will do little to boost impact, unless there is broad agreement around a unified framework designed for 21<sup>st</sup> century challenges. This requires integrating the national security perspective of foreign assistance as a 'soft power' tool intended to achieve diplomatic and strategic ends, with that of a 'development tool' allocated according to policy effectiveness and human needs."

The document has ten chapters, each of which addresses one or more facets of foreign assistance:

- 1) A Unified Framework for U.S. Foreign Assistance in the 21st Century.
- 2) Organizing U.S. Foreign Assistance to Meet 21st Century Challenges.
- 3) U.S. Assistance in the Fight Against Global HIV/AIDS.
- 4) Strengthening U.S. Development Assistance.
- 5) Humanitarian Assistance Expands in Scale and Scope.
- 6) Development in the Shadow of Conflict.
- 7) The Changing Complexion of Security and Strategic Assistance in the 21st Century.
- 8) Removing Impediments to an Effective Partnership with Congress.
- 9) Foreign Aid Reform Commissions, Task Forces, and Initiatives: The Record from Kennedy to Bush II.
- 10) Reforming Development Assistance: Lessons from the UK Experience.

#### ◆ U.S. FOREIGN AID TO THE PALESTINIANS

Jeremy M. Sharp and Christopher M. Blanchard, Analysts in Middle Eastern Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division

Congressional Research Service, The Library of Congress, updated June 27, 2006, 6 p.

<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/68794.pdf>

"Since the formation of a Hamas-led Palestinian Authority government in March 2006, the U.S. Administration has suspended its foreign assistance program in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. U.S. policy makers have stated that foreign aid cannot resume until Hamas, a U.S. State Department-designated Foreign Terrorist Organization (FTO), renounces, among other things, its commitment to the destruction of the state of Israel and the use of terrorist violence. Hamas has not complied with these demands. In the meantime, media reports suggest that the humanitarian situation for many Palestinians living in the West Bank and Gaza Strip is worsening. The Quartet (the United States, Russia, European Union, and United Nations), in conjunction with the World Bank, has attempted to forge a temporary solution that will avoid working with the Hamas-led government while providing some relief to the Palestinians. Nevertheless, some details of such an arrangement remain undetermined. The Palestinians are the largest per capita recipients of foreign aid worldwide and, with a shattered economy, are mostly dependent on external support to meet basic needs."

#### Landmines

#### ◆ TO WALK THE EARTH IN SAFETY, 6TH EDITION

United States Department of State, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs. June 27, 2006. 60 p.

<http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/68529.pdf>

The 6th edition of this comprehensive annual report is published by the Office of Weapons Removal and Abatement in the U.S. Department of State's Bureau of Political-Military Affairs. It documents the United States' efforts to clear landmines, assist landmine survivors, and reduce trafficking of small arms and light weapons. This report catalogues the activities of the interagency U.S. Humanitarian Mine Action Program in 30 countries during 2004 and 2005.

During the period covered by this report, the United States announced its new, precedent-setting landmine policy, which includes the banning of all non-detectable mines. The policy surpasses several of the provisions of both of the world's international landmine treaties, including Amended Protocol II to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons, to which the United States is a party. Total U.S. contributions to humanitarian mine action also passed the \$1 billion mark in 2005.

Profiled in the report are the: \*Office of Weapons Removal and Abatement (<[www.state.gov/t/pm/wra](http://www.state.gov/t/pm/wra)>) \*U.S. Department of Defense's Humanitarian Demining Training Center \*Humanitarian Demining Research and Development Program of the U.S. Army's Night Vision and Electronic Sensors Directorate \*Mine Action Information Center at James Madison University \*Mine Detection Dog Center for South East Europe in Bosnia and Herzegovina \*Regional Center for Underwater Demining in Montenegro.

The report also features vignettes on the U.S. Department of State's Quick Reaction Demining Force, the only standing humanitarian demining unit that can rapidly deploy worldwide, and U.S. efforts to keep man-portable air defense systems (MANPADS) out of the hands of criminals and terrorists.

#### Latin America

#### ◆ CUBA: ISSUES FOR THE 109TH CONGRESS

Mark P. Sullivan, Specialist in Latin American Affairs, Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division

Congressional Research Service, The Library of Congress, updated June 23, 2006, 61 p.  
<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/69422.pdf>

"Cuba under Fidel Castro remains a hard-line communist state with a poor record on human rights — a record that has worsened since 2003. Since the early 1960s, U.S. policy toward Cuba has consisted largely of isolating the island nation through comprehensive economic sanctions. Another component of U.S. policy consists of support measures for the Cuban people, including private humanitarian donations and U.S.-sponsored radio and television broadcasting to Cuba. The Bush Administration has further tightened restrictions on travel, remittances and private humanitarian assistance, and the payment process for U.S. agricultural exports to Cuba. While there appears to be broad agreement on the overall objective of U.S. policy toward Cuba — to help bring democracy and respect for human rights to the island — there are several schools of thought on how to achieve that objective. Some advocate maximum pressure on the Cuban government until reforms are enacted; others argue for lifting some U.S. sanctions that they believe are hurting the Cuban people. Still others call for a swift normalization of U.S.-Cuban relations."

## **Middle East**

### **♦ EGYPT: BACKGROUND AND U.S. RELATIONS**

Jeremy M. Sharp, Middle East Policy Analyst, Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division  
Congressional Research Service, The Library of Congress, updated June 14, 2006, 37 p.  
<http://fpc.state.gov/fpc/c16426.htm>

This report provides an overview of Egyptian politics and current issues in U.S.- Egyptian relations. It briefly provides a political history of modern Egypt, an overview of its political institutions, and a discussion of the prospects for democratization in Egypt. U.S.-Egyptian relations are complex and multi-faceted, and this report addresses the following current topics: the Arab-Israeli peace process, Iraq, terrorism, democratization and reform, human rights, trade, and military cooperation.

### **♦ IRAN: U.S. CONCERNS AND POLICY RESPONSES**

Kenneth Katzman, Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division  
Congressional Research Service, The Library of Congress, June 21, 2006, 48 p.  
<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/68793.pdf>

"Mistrust between the United States and Iran's Islamic regime has run deep for over two decades, even before the emergence of a dispute over Iran's nuclear program. Many experts say that all factions in Iran are united on major national security issues and that U.S.-Iran relations might not improve unless or until the Islamic regime is removed or moderates substantially, even if a nuclear deal is reached and implemented. Others say that, despite Ahmadinejad's presidency, the United States and Iran have a common interest in stability in the Persian Gulf and South Asia regions in the aftermath of the defeat of the Taliban and the regime of Saddam Hussein. Those who take this view say that Iran is far more secure now that the United States has removed these two regimes, and it might be more willing than previously to accommodate U.S. interests in the Gulf. Others say that the opposite is more likely, that Iran now feels more encircled than ever by pro-U.S. regimes and U.S. forces guided by a policy of pre-emption, and Iran might redouble its efforts to develop WMD and other capabilities to deter the United States."

### **♦ IRAN'S INFLUENCE IN IRAQ**

Kenneth Katzman, Specialist in Middle Eastern Affairs, Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division  
Congressional Research Service, The Library of Congress, updated June 13, 2006, 6 p.  
<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/68285.pdf>

"Iran's influence over the post-Saddam government in Iraq is substantial because the



predominant parties in that government have long enjoyed Tehran's sponsorship. An emerging concern is that Iran's influence has extended to support for militant groups in Iraq. U.S. officials say that sophisticated explosive devices are entering Iraq from Iran, suggesting that Iran, or factions within Iran, are backing Iraqi factions that use violence to oppose the U.S. presence in Iraq."

#### ◆ **LEBANON**

Alfred B. Prados, Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division  
Congressional Research Service, The Library of Congress, updated June 8, 2006, 19 p.  
<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/68811.pdf>

After meeting with President Bush in Washington on April 18, 2006, Prime Minister Siniora said in an interview with Lally Weymouth carried in Newsweek that he asked President Bush for three things: to empower the Lebanese government politically through restoration of all its territories (including the disputed Shib'a Farms territory, see below); to help build the capabilities of Lebanon's armed forces and security forces; and to empower the government economically.

#### ◆ **LIBYA: BACKGROUND AND U.S. RELATIONS**

Christopher M. Blanchard, Analyst in Middle Eastern Affairs, Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division  
Congressional Research Service, The Library of Congress, updated June 13, 2006, 33 p.  
<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/68810.pdf>

This report provides background information on Libyan history and U.S.-Libyan relations; profiles Libyan leader Muammar Al Qadhafi; discusses current political and economic reform efforts; and reviews current issues of potential congressional interest. For information about Libya see CRS Report RL32604, *Libya: Legislative Basis for U.S. Economic Sanctions*, by Dianne E. Rennack, and CRS Report RS21823, *Disarming Libya: Weapons of Mass Destruction*, by Sharon A. Squassoni and Andrew Feickert.

#### ◆ **SYRIA: U.S. RELATIONS AND BILATERAL ISSUES**

Alfred B. Prados, Specialist in Middle Eastern Affairs, Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division  
Congressional Research Service, The Library of Congress, June 22, 2006, 22 p.  
<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/68806.pdf>

The death of Syrian President Hafiz al-Asad in June 2000 after a 30-year presidency removed a key figure in the affairs of Syria and the region. His son and successor President Bashar al-Asad does not yet appear to have acquired the uncontested power that his father exercised. Although U.S.-Syrian relations improved somewhat in the 1990s, further strains appeared after the breakdown in Syrian-Israeli negotiations in 2000, Syria's opposition to a U.S. military campaign in Iraq, and disagreements over Syria's former role in Lebanon. Members of Congress have periodically introduced legislation to tighten U.S. sanctions against Syria or to condition relaxation of existing restrictions on further changes in Syrian policy.

### **Peacekeeping**

#### ◆ **UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING: ISSUES FOR CONGRESS**

Marjorie Ann Browne.  
Congressional Research Service, The Library of Congress, updated June 16, 2006. 19 p.  
<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/68290.pdf>

The role of the United Nations (UN) in facilitating dispute settlement and establishing peacekeeping operations to monitor cease-fires and participate in other duties as assigned by the U.N. Security Council, increased markedly in the late 1980s. Between April 1988 and April 1994, a total of 20 peacekeeping operations were set up, involving 16 different situations. Since May

1994, however, the pace of Council creation of new UN- controlled peacekeeping operations dropped noticeably. This occurred as a result of the U.S. decision, in Presidential Decision Directive 25 (PDD 25), signed May 1994, to follow strict criteria for determining its support for an operation. [See text of PDD 25 at: <<http://www.fas.org/irp/offdocs/pdd25.htm>>]. This U.S. decision was accompanied by a Security Council statement adopting similar criteria.

A major issue facing the United Nations, the United States, and Congress concerning United Nations peacekeeping is the extent to which the United Nations has the capacity to restore or keep the peace in the changing world environment. Associated with this issue, is the need for a reliable source of funding and other resources for improved efficiencies of operation.

For the U.S. Congress, major considerations on UN peacekeeping stem from executive branch commitments made in the UN Security Council. The concern with these commitments, made through votes in the Council, is the extent to which they bind the United States, both militarily and financially, to fund and to participate in some way in an operation. One discussion topic is the placing of U.S. military personnel under the control of foreign commanders.

### **South & Central Asia**

#### **♦ AFGHANISTAN AND ITS NEIGHBORS: AN EVER DANGEROUS NEIGHBORHOOD**

Marvin G. Weinbaum.

United States Institute of Peace (USIP). June 2006, 20 p.

<http://www.usip.org/pubs/specialreports/sr162.pdf>

The fate of Afghanistan and the success of U.S. and coalition efforts to stabilize Afghanistan will in large measure be affected by the current and future policies pursued by other countries in the region. The author evaluates the courses of action key neighbors may take that will affect Afghanistan's physical, political and economic security. Weinbaum stresses the following themes:

- \* Predatory neighbors have been a fact of life for the Afghan state throughout most of its history. In defense, Afghans have chosen both isolation and resistance. Today, openness and cooperation with regional powers offers the best prospects for security and economic progress for Afghanistan.
- \* Conversely, the region's political stability and economic potential are broadly influenced by the ability of post-conflict Afghanistan to succeed in its recovery.
- \* The region's opportunistic states are liable to revive their interventions in Afghanistan in the event of a faltering Kabul government or an international community that reneges on its commitments to help secure and rebuild the country. Already there are some indications that the forbearance shown by neighbors in recent years may be flagging.
- \* Pakistan and Iran offer Afghanistan its most imposing and critical regional bilateral relationships. Whether they cooperate or create obstacles for Afghanistan's recovery is greatly influenced by American strategic policies in the region.

#### **♦ CENTRAL ASIA AND ITS ASIAN NEIGHBORS: SECURITY AND COMMERCE AT THE CROSSROADS**

Rollie Lal

RAND. June 28, 2006, 64 p.

[http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2006/RAND\\_MG440.pdf](http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2006/RAND_MG440.pdf)

China, Iran, Afghanistan, India, and Pakistan, with historic links and strong interests in the region, are critical players in the security and economic issues that will determine the future of Central Asia and affect U.S. interests in the region. Although these Asian states do not agree on how to secure Afghanistan against threats, there is unanimous agreement that a stable Afghanistan is critical to their own security interests.



By assessing the developing relations between Central Asia and its Asian neighbors, it is evident that each country stands to benefit from stability and economic growth in Central Asia, but opinion toward U.S. presence and policy in the region could be a point of conflict. The purpose of this monograph is to provide an assessment of the nature of Asian states' interest and influence in Central Asia in order to determine the development of these relationships and how they will shape strategic dynamics of Asia in the coming years.

#### ♦ **CENTRAL ASIA: REGIONAL DEVELOPMENTS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR U.S. INTERESTS**

Jim Nichol, Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division

Congressional Research Service, The Library of Congress, June 5, 2006, 24 p.

<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/68821.pdf>

"After the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, the United States recognized the independence of all the former Central Asian republics, supported their admission into Western organizations, and elicited Turkish support to counter Iranian influence in the region. Congress was at the forefront in urging the formation of coherent U.S. policies for aiding these and other Eurasian states of the former Soviet Union."

#### ♦ **PAKISTAN-U.S. RELATIONS**

K. Alan Kronstadt, Analyst in Asian Affairs, Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division

Congressional Research Service, The Library of Congress, June 21, 2006, 24 p.

<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/68795.pdf>

"U.S. policy interests in Pakistan encompass a wide range of issues, including counterterrorism, nuclear weapons and missile proliferation, South Asian and Afghan stability, democratization and human rights, trade and economic reform, and efforts to counter narcotics trafficking. Relations have been affected by several key developments, including proliferation- and democracy-related sanctions; a continuing Pakistan-India nuclear standoff and conflict over Kashmir; and the September 2001 terrorist attacks against the United States. In the wake of those attacks, President Musharraf — under strong U.S. diplomatic pressure — offered President Bush Pakistan's 'unstinted cooperation in the fight against terrorism.' Pakistan became a vital ally in the U.S.-led anti-terrorism coalition. U.S. sanctions relating to Pakistan's 1998 nuclear tests and 1999 military coup quickly were waived and, in October 2001, large amounts of U.S. aid began flowing into Pakistan. Direct assistance programs include training and equipment for Pakistani security forces, along with aid for health, education, food, democracy promotion, human rights improvement, counternarcotics, border security and law enforcement, as well as trade preference benefits. The United States also supports grant, loan, and debt rescheduling programs for Pakistan by the various major international financial institutions. In June 2004, President Bush designated Pakistan as a major non-NATO ally of the United States under Section 517 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. Revelations that Pakistan has been a source of nuclear proliferation to North Korea, Iran, and Libya may complicate future Pakistan-U.S. relations."

#### ♦ **U.S. NUCLEAR COOPERATION WITH INDIA: ISSUES FOR CONGRESS**

Sharon Squassoni, Specialist in National Defense, Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division

Congressional Research Service, The Library of Congress, updated June 27, 2006, 35 p.

<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/68933.pdf>

"The Bush Administration had been considering a strategic partnership with India as early as 2001... On July 18, 2005, President Bush announced the creation of a global partnership with India in a joint statement with Prime Minister Manmohan Singh ... The Joint Statement noted that the United States 'will work with friends and allies to adjust international regimes to enable full civil nuclear energy cooperation and trade with India, including but not limited to expeditious consideration of fuel supplies for safeguarded nuclear reactors at Tarapur'."

## **War on Terror**

### **◆ THE COST OF IRAQ, AFGHANISTAN, AND OTHER GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR OPERATIONS SINCE 9/11**

Amy Belasco, Specialist in National Defense, Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division  
Congressional Research Service, The Library of Congress, updated June 14, 2006, 39 p.  
<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/68791.pdf>

"If both houses of Congress pass the conference version of the FY2006 supplemental bill (H.R. 4939) Congress would have appropriated a total of about \$437 billion for military operations, base security, reconstruction, foreign aid, embassy costs, and veterans' health care for the three operations initiated since the 9/11 attacks: Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) covering Afghanistan and other Global War on Terror (GWOT) operations, Operation Noble Eagle (ONE) providing enhanced security at military bases, and Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF), Iraq. The \$437 billion total does not include the \$50 billion "placeholder" figure for FY2007 war costs that is listed in the FY2007 budget because the Administration has not yet formally submitted its request. The Administration has not yet provided any information about what the \$50 billion would include."

## **Miscellaneous**

### **◆ DIVERSITY AS FOREIGN POLICY ASSET**

Michael Werz.  
German Marshall Fund of the United States. June 2006. 31 p.  
[http://www.gmfus.org/doc/GMF\\_DiversForPolicy\\_Werz0530.pdf](http://www.gmfus.org/doc/GMF_DiversForPolicy_Werz0530.pdf)

This document argues that Europe's, and specifically Germany's, demographic changes over the last 15 years have not been reflected in the makeup of its governments and especially its foreign policy and foreign service. Werz makes a case that European governments could learn much from the United States' experience with its own foreign service and diversity in government.

"Former CIA director George Tenet said that 'the diversification of the CIA's workforce is not only nice to have, it's critical.' Only three days after being appointed secretary of state, Colin Powell echoed that statement when he said, 'America overseas ought to look more like America at home.'"

The author writes: "The U.S. government sees diversity in its workforce as not just an important strategy, but one that is necessary for the security of the nation and its people. Government hiring in Europe has been very slow to embrace the comparative advantages of a diverse labor pool, and foreign policy institutions in Germany and other European countries have little or no experience in conceiving and implementing employment plans that increase diversity."

### **◆ FOREIGN OPERATIONS (HOUSE)/STATE, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, AND RELATED PROGRAMS (SENATE): FY2007 APPROPRIATIONS**

Larry Nowels, Connie Veillette and Susan B. Epstein.  
Congressional Research Service, The Library of Congress, updated May 25, 2006, 63 p.  
<http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/crs/rl33420.pdf>

Major issues confronting Congress in considering the Foreign Operations and State Department/Broadcasting appropriations request for FY2007 include:

- \* The overall size of the Foreign Operations request - a 14.4% increase over regular FY2006 Foreign Operations funds;
- \* Proposed cuts in spending on core bilateral development assistance and programs in Latin America;
- \* A 71% increase in appropriations for the Millennium Challenge Account; and
- \* Secretary Rice's Transformational Diplomacy initiative for the State Department which calls for repositioning American diplomats, creating regional public diplomacy centers, locating small posts

outside foreign capitals, training in new skills and languages, and fostering working relationships with the Defense Department and other federal agencies.

On May 25, 2006, the House Appropriations Committee recommended a \$21.3 billion Foreign Operations spending measure, \$597 million larger than current FY2006 levels, but nearly \$2.4 billion less than the request.

#### ◆ POWS AND MIAS: STATUS AND ACCOUNTING ISSUES

Charles A. Henning.

Congressional Research Service, The Library of Congress, June 1, 2006, 16 p.

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/RL33452.pdf>

There has been a long-running controversy about the fate of certain U.S. prisoners of war (POWs) and service members missing in action (MIAs) as a result of various U.S. military operations. While few people familiar with the issue feel that any Americans are still being held against their will in communist countries associated with the Cold War, more feel that some may have been so held in the past in the Soviet Union, China, North Korea, or North Vietnam. Similarly, few believe there has been a "conspiracy" to cover up the existence of live POWs, but many would maintain that there was, at least during the 1970s, U.S. government mismanagement of the issue.

Normalization of relations with Vietnam exacerbated this longstanding debate. Supporters contend that Vietnamese cooperation on the POW/MIA issue has greatly increased. Opponents argue that cooperation has in fact been much less than supporters say, and that the Vietnamese can only be induced to cooperate by firmness rather than conciliation. There are those that believe Americans are now held, or were after the war ended, even if no specific report of live Americans has thus far met rigorous proofs. Others, who doubt live Americans are still held, or were after the war ended, argue that despite vast efforts, only one live American military prisoner remained in Indochina after the war (a defector who returned in 1979). The U.S. government indicates the possibility that Americans are still being held in Indochina cannot be ruled out. Some say Americans may have been kept by the Vietnamese after the war but killed later. Increased U.S. access to Vietnam has not yet led to a large reduction in the number of Americans still listed as unaccounted for.

There is considerable evidence that prisoners from the end of World War II, the Korean War, and "Cold War shootdowns" of U.S. military aircraft may have been taken to the USSR and not returned. The evidence about POWs from Vietnam being taken to the Soviet Union is more questionable. There is evidence that Navy pilot Scott Speicher, shot down on the first night of the 1991 Persian Gulf War, and until recently listed as "killed in action" rather than "missing in action," was almost certainly captured by the Iraqis. Information about his fate has not yet been discovered by U.S. and coalition forces in Iraq. All American POWs captured by the Iraqis during the initial stage of the current war were returned to U.S. control; the remains of all others listed as MIA have been recovered. One U.S. Army soldier, captured by Iraqi insurgents on April 9, 2004, is currently listed as a POW; there has been no word about his fate since his POW status was confirmed by the Department of Defense on April 23, 2004.

#### ◆ PROTECTION OF NATIONAL SECURITY INFORMATION

Jennifer K. Elsea.

Congressional Research Service, The Library of Congress, June 30, 2006, 26 p.

<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/68797.pdf>

Recent cases involving alleged disclosures of classified information to the news media or others who are not entitled to receive it have renewed Congress's interest with regard to the possible need for legislation to provide for criminal punishment for the "leaks" of classified information.

The Espionage Act of 1917 and other statutes and regulations provide a web of authorities for the protection of various types of sensitive information, but some have expressed concern that gaps in these laws may make prosecution of some disclosures impossible.

The 106th Congress passed a measure to criminalize leaks, but President Clinton vetoed it. The 108th Congress reconsidered the same provision, but instead passed a requirement for the relevant agencies to review the need for such a proscription. The Department of Justice, in turn, reported that existing statutes and regulations are sufficient to prosecute disclosures of information that might harm the national security.

This report provides background on previous legislative efforts to criminalize the unauthorized disclosure of classified information; describes the current state of the laws that potentially apply, including criminal and civil penalties that can be imposed on violators; and some of the disciplinary actions and administrative procedures available to federal government agencies, that have been addressed by federal courts. Finally, the report considers the possible First Amendment implications of applying the Espionage Act to prosecute newspapers for publishing classified national defense information.

#### **♦ SECURITY CLASSIFIED AND CONTROLLED INFORMATION: HISTORY, STATUS, AND EMERGING MANAGEMENT ISSUES**

Harold C. Relyea.

Congressional Research Service, The Library of Congress, June 26, 2006, 36 p.

<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/secretcy/RL33494.pdf>

Current security classification arrangements, prescribed by an executive order (EO) of the President, trace their origins to a March 1940 directive issued by President Franklin D. Roosevelt as E.O. 8381. This development was prompted by desires to clarify the authority of civilian personnel in the national defense community to classify information, to establish a broader basis for protecting military information in view of growing global hostilities, and to manage better a discretionary power seemingly of increasing importance to the entire executive branch.

Since September 11, 2001, several issues have arisen regarding security classified and controlled information. The volume is a concern: 8 million new classification actions in 2001 jumped to 14 million new actions in 2005, while the quantity of declassified pages dropped from 100 million in 2001 to 29 million in 2005. Expense is an issue: \$4.5 billion spent on classification in 2001 increased to \$7.1 billion in 2004, while declassification costs fell from \$232 million in 2001 to \$48.3 million in 2004, according to annual reports by the Information Security Oversight Office (ISOO) of the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA).

Some agencies were recently discovered to be withdrawing archived records from public access, and reclassifying them. ISOO has indicated that the federal government needs to apply a more integrated approach among the classifying agencies. The force of, and authority for, information control markings, other than security classification labels, have come under congressional scrutiny, prompting concerns about their number, variety, lack of underlying managerial regimes, and effects. Among those effects, contend the Government Accountability Office and the manager of the Information Sharing Environment for the intelligence community, is the obstruction of information sharing across the federal government and with state and local governments. These and related matters, including remedial legislation (H.R. 2331, H.R. 5112, H.R. 5441), are examined in this report.

**Visit the IRC website at**

**<http://france.usembassy.gov/irc/default.htm>**

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆ ◆